

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. **If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, or believes that some or all of the claims are not in condition for allowance, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to schedule a telephone Examiner Interview before any further actions on the merits.**

The applicants will now address each of the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action.

Objections

The abstract was objected because it should not exceed 15 lines of text. The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of objection in view of the following.

The abstract has been amended such that it does not exceed 15 lines of text. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 11-14, 20-23 and 29 are rejected 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Application No. 6,771,896 ("the Tamura patent") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0071035 ("the Sobol publication"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

The Examiner contends that the Tamura patent discloses a print system formed of a digital camera (100) and a printer (250), each including control means for controlling operations thereof, functionally connected one to another (citing col. 6, line 61; col. 3, line 32; col. 5, line 28; and Fig. 9 of the Tamura patent); wherein the digital camera (100) has a configuration wherein the data forming an image which is to be printed with the printer (250) can be supplied to the printer (citing col. 2, line 30 of the Tamura patent), a secondary battery, which is a power source thereof, can be charged by receiving electric power supplied from the printer (citing col. 2, line 15; and col. 17 line 9 of the Tamura patent), and the state of each function including the state of the secondary battery can be displayed on a predetermined display unit, under control of the control means thereof (citing col. 5, line 28; Fig. 9; col. 13, line 46; and col. 7, line 50 of the Tamura patent); and wherein the printer (250) has a configuration wherein an image can be printed based upon the image data supplied from the digital camera (100) (citing col. 16, line 64 of the Tamura patent), and electric power can be supplied to the digital camera (100) so as to charge the secondary battery thereof, under control of the control means thereof (citing col. 17, line 9 of the Tamura patent); and wherein the digital camera (100) has a configuration wherein in the event

that the digital camera (100) and the printer (250) are functionally connected one to another, a display is displayed on a predetermined display unit (18) thereof for notifying the state of the secondary battery (citing col. 7, line 50 and col. 13, line 46 of the Tamura patent).

The Examiner concedes that the Tamura patent does not teach that a secondary battery, which is a power source of the camera, can be charged by receiving electric power supplied by the printer. However, the Examiner contends that the Sobol publication discloses that the printer provides power to the imaging device to operate its processors and to recharge its batteries (citing the abstract of the Sobol publication). (See also, Figs. 1-3 of the Sobol patent.). The Examiner contends that it would have therefore been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to improve the Tamura patent in view of the teachings of the Sobol publication in order to recharge the camera's secondary battery via printer power supply.

The applicants respectfully submit that the Tamura patent in view of the Sobol publication does not teach a digital camera wherein the digital camera includes a secondary battery which is a power source thereof and which can be charged by receiving electric power supplied from the printer and, wherein ***the state of the secondary battery can be displayed on a predetermined display unit under control of the control means thereof.***

Specifically, in the present invention, the digital camera's secondary battery can be charged by receiving electric power supplied from the printer and ***the state of the battery is determined by the control means of the***

camera itself and displayed on the camera's display unit (LCD 15) under control of the control means thereof.

Referring to the left hand side of the flowchart of Fig. 3 of the present application (digital camera operations), it is clear that the control means of the digital camera is responsible for determining the state of the secondary battery and displaying it on the camera's display unit. (See especially Fig. 3, steps S4-S8; page 40, second paragraph and page 42, second paragraph of the present application.) Referring to the right hand side of the flowchart of Fig. 3 of the present application (printer operations), it is clear that the control means of the printer does not contribute to the determination and display of the state of the camera's secondary battery on the camera's display unit. The camera (10) includes a sub-controller (63) which serves as a battery monitoring system which monitors the state of the secondary battery (64). (See Fig. 2, sub-controller (63); and page 31, first paragraph of the present application). The camera's control means including the battery monitoring system may determine charging state information of the secondary battery. Such information may include the percentage of battery charged, whether the battery is being charged, whether there is a battery loaded into the camera, etc. (See Figures 6-8, and 11-13 of the present application.)

On the other hand, the Tamura patent teaches that the camera (100) may first send state information of the batteries within the camera to the printer (250) wherein **the control means of the printer** may process the state information, and depending on the order information (print job) that needs to be executed, the printer may

send a warning signal to the camera to be displayed on the camera's display unit (18). Therefore, **in the Tamura patent, it is the printer's control means that determines battery state information to be displayed and whether a state of the camera's batteries needs to be displayed, not the camera's control means** as claimed.

In particular, the printer (250) in the Tamura patent merely determines whether there is enough energy in the camera's batteries for a print job to be completed and based on that determination a warning signal may be sent to the camera (100) to be displayed on display unit (18). (See Fig. 9, col. 13, lines 47-67; col. 14, lines 6-28; of the Tamura patent.) **The digital camera (100) in the Tamura patent does not determine, nor does it display, a charging state of the camera's batteries.** Rather, it merely **determines whether there is enough battery power for a print job to be completed which has been determined by the printer (250).** Note that in Figs. 11a-11c of the Tamura patent, the warnings displayed on the camera's display unit (18) simply indicate whether there is enough battery power for a print job to be completed and may prompt the user to supply fresh batteries or use an external power supply. Nowhere, does the Tamura patent teach a digital camera having batteries charged by receiving power supplied from the printer, and in which the state of the camera's batteries can be displayed on a predetermined display unit under control of the camera's control means.

Furthermore, in the claimed invention, the digital camera has a configuration wherein **in the event that the digital camera and the printer are functionally connected one to another, a display is displayed on a predetermined**

display unit (See Fig. 1, camera's display unit (15)) thereof for notifying the state of the secondary battery.

(See Fig. 3, steps S4-S8, page 40, second paragraph; and page 42, second paragraph of the present application.) To the contrary, the Tamura patent teaches that **a display may be displayed on the camera's (100) display unit (18) for notifying the state of the battery** (warning the user of whether there is enough battery power for a print job to be completed) **only when order information is sent to the printer (250)**. (See Figs. 9 and 11a-11c; col. 13, lines 38-7; and col. 14, lines 6-28 of the Tamura patent.) Therefore, in the Tamura patent, the digital camera (100) does not necessarily display the state of the camera's battery in the event that the camera and printer (250) are functionally connected one to another.

The Sobol publication concerns a printer (100) having a holding portion (150) attached thereto adapted to receive an imaging device (200), wherein while the imaging device is located within the holding portion, the printer (100) provides power to the imaging device (200) to operate its processors and to recharge its batteries. (See the abstract; and Fig. 1-3 of the Sobol publication). However, **the imaging device/digital camera (200) does not have a displaying unit for notifying the state of the camera's batteries, nor does the camera (200) actually notify a user of the state of the camera's batteries**. The Sobol publication merely teaches that an LED light (182) located on the printer (100) may serve as an indicator for notifying the user that the digital camera (200) is correctly placed in the holding portion (150) of the printer (100) as well as notifying that the camera's batteries are being charged. Nothing is

displayed on the camera, nor is the state of the batteries being determined. (See, e.g., Figs. 1-3; and paragraphs [0027] and [0035] of the Sobol publication.)

As can be appreciated from the foregoing, even assuming that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the Tamura patent and the Sobol publication, such combination would not both (1) recharge the camera's secondary battery via printer power supply, and (2) display the state of the secondary battery, on a predetermined display unit of the camera, under control of the control means of the camera, for notifying the state of the secondary battery in the event that camera and the printer are functionally connected one to another.

Accordingly independent claims 1, 11, and 20 are not rendered obvious by the Tamura patent and the Sobol publication for at least the foregoing reasons. Since claims 2-10, 12-19, and 21-28 depend, either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 11, and 20, these claims are similarly not rendered obvious by the Tamura patent and the Sobol publication.

Claims 6, 15 and 24 are rejected 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable the Tamura patent in view of the Sobol publication, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,515,704 ("the Sato patent"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following:

Even assuming, arguendo, that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine these references as proposed by the Examiner, the purported teachings of the

Sato patent would not compensate for the deficiencies of the Tamura patent and the Sobol publication, discussed above. Thus, claims 6, 15 and 24 are not rendered obvious by the Tamura patent, the Sobol publication and the Sato patent for at least this reason.

Claims 7-9, 16-18 and 25-27 are rejected 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable the Tamura patent in view of the Sobol publication, and in further view of the Sato patent and U.S. Patent No. 6,001,436 ("the Anderson patent"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine these references as proposed by the Examiner, the purported teachings of the Sato and Anderson patents would not compensate for the deficiencies of the Tamura patent and the Sobol publication, discussed above. Thus, claims 7-9, 16-18 and 25-27 are not rendered obvious by the Tamura patent, the Sobol publication, the Sato patent and the Anderson patent for at least this reason.

Claims 10, 19 and 28 are rejected 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable the Tamura patent in view of the Sobol publication, and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/003576 ("the Konishi Publication"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine these references as

proposed by the Examiner, the purported teachings of the Konishi publication would not compensate for the deficiencies of the Tamura patent and the Sobol publication, discussed above. Thus, claims 10, 19 and 28 are not rendered obvious by the Tamura patent, the Sobol publication and the Konishi patent for at least this reason.

Claims 30 and 31 are rejected 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable the Tamura patent in view of the Sobol publication, and in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 4,332,445 ("the Hosono patent"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

The Examiner contends that the Tamura patent in view of the Sobol publication, as discussed earlier, and in further view of the Hosono patent teach a digital camera having a configuration wherein charging of the secondary battery employed therein, performed by the charger, is stopped during a period in time of the thermal head of the printer being driven, under control of the control means of the camera and the control means of the printer, communicating with each other.

The Hosono patent merely teaches of a camera having a flash (12) and an additional electrical device such as a data printing device (11) all powered by only one source provided in a camera body (power source E), wherein the camera includes a charging stop switch in addition to a power switch so that the charging of the capacitor for the flash (12) may be stopped while the additional electrically operated device such as a data

printing device (11) is electrically operated in order to prevent potential malfunction of the additional electrically operated device. (See the abstract; Fig. 2; and col. 2, lines 15-20 of the Hosono patent.)

The Hosono patent is fundamentally different from the claimed invention for the following reasons. First, the Hosono patent does not concern charging a camera's batteries, but rather charging a strobe attached to the camera body. Second, the Hosono patent does not teach a camera **connected to a printer** for printing image data obtained from the camera, but rather a camera including a printing device in its camera body. The printing device is used for printing data such as date of photographing on the film loaded in the camera. The Hosono patent teaches that the camera with its internal printing device along with the strobe attached to the camera's body are all powered by a **single power source** such as the camera's batteries. (See abstract, Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 15-20; of the Hosono patent.) Thus any teachings of the Hosono patent concern a device having a single power source (a battery) which is not being charged from an external device (e.g., a printer) connected to an AC power source.

Thus, the structure of the camera, the printing device, and the strobe along with the function of the charging stop switch and power switch as taught by the Hosono patent is fundamentally different from the present invention. To summarize, the Hosono patent concerns charging a capacitor of a strobe attached to camera having an internal printer and a single power source (a battery) while the claimed invention concerns charging a camera's battery via a connected printer which is connected with an AC power source. Therefore, one

skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine these references as proposed by the Examiner. Thus, independent claims 30 and 31 are not rendered unpatentable by these references for at least this reason.

Further, even assuming, *arguendo*, that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine these references as proposed by the Examiner, the purported teachings of the Hosono patent would not compensate for the deficiencies of the Tamura patent and the Sobol publication, discussed above.

Accordingly, independent claims 30 and 31 are not rendered obvious by the Tamura patent in view of the Sobol publication, and in further view of the Hosono patent for at least the foregoing reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicants request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Any arguments made in this amendment pertain ***only*** to the specific aspects of the invention ***claimed***. Any claim amendments or cancellations, and any arguments, are made ***without prejudice to, or disclaimer of***, the applicant's right to seek patent protection of any unclaimed (e.g., narrower, broader, different) subject matter, such as by way of a continuation or divisional patent application for example.

Respectfully submitted,

October 30, 2007

John C. Pokotylo
John C. Pokotylo, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,242
Tel.: (732) 542-9070

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper (and any accompanying paper(s)) is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent Office on the date shown below.

John C. Pokotylo

Type or print name of person signing certification

John C. Pokotylo
Signature

October 30, 2007
Date